

Application No: 09/804,385

12

REMARKS

In response to the final office action dated 5/20/2004, applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments to the claims, appropriately address the objections and rejections to the application, and in addition helps to clarify the intended purpose of the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 21-36, now clearly state that visual marking occurs on the actual displayed data, based on a prior step of determining the display status of the entire data set, and as a result, sufficiently narrows the claims and differentiates this invention from the process of highlighting URL's as taught by Bates, et al. (US patent 6,184,886).

Applicant further respectfully submits that the highlighting of URL's as taught by Bates is limited to highlighting the URL name or label itself, residing in a separate list, different from the data file that it represents. The URL, as Bates teaches, is a representation or a link to the actual data in the web page, and is separately located. Bates also teaches that highlighting of the URL occurs when the URL is manually selected, which may or may not access or open the associated data or web page (it may just highlight it), and does not specifically track which data in the web page may or may not have been displayed, and does not specifically mark displayed data within the web page or data file. Thus manually selecting the URL and additionally opening the represented web page does not reflect on which portions of the web page were or were not displayed. Accordingly Bates does not teach of determining display status of individual displayed data in the web page which is represented by the URL. A web page may have been selected, causing the listed URL to be highlighted, and little or no

Application No: 09/804,385

13

data have been displayed. Furthermore, Bates teaches a manual selection process, which along with any other state of the art manual selection and highlighting process, has no relation to the automatic marking process of the present invention.

As to claims 26 and 33, and the fading away of marking with time, applicant submits that it is not inherently shown by Bates, because clearing cookies or history files only relates to the highlighted URL label and not portions of data within a data set, which may or may not be marked according to its display status, as in the present invention.

As to claims 28 and 35, and the conversion of marked data to selected data for an editing system, although any text or data entities can be cut and pasted into different applications it must first be selected. The automatic marking process of the current invention eliminates the step of manual selection, whereby the marking automatically tags the data to be acted upon by the editor.

As to claims 29 and 36, and collecting statistics for the display session, Bates teaches of staging URL links or bookmarks, which, in light of the above discussion are relevant only to URL representations of web pages and not to specific portions of a data set, as described in the current invention.

Applicant further respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 24-25, and 31-32 with reference to Bates et al., in view of Bernhardt et al., have been resolved in light of the above amendments and discussion with respect to Bates highlighting only the URL, and with the additional argument that the grouping feature of Bernhardt is not related to determining display status.

Application No: 09/804,385

14

Applicant further respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 37-40 with reference to Bates et al., in view of Wolfe, have been resolved in light of claims 37 - 40 being cancelled.

Applicant further respectfully submits that newly-added claims 41 - 44 , are also allowable in light of the above discussion.

CONCLUSION

The applicant believes that the Examiner will now find the claims of this application allowable. Favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously requested.

The applicant is proceeding with this application on a pro se basis, and is available at any time for discussion of the amendments, in person at the examiners location, or by telephone.

Respectfully Submitted,



Edwin G. Watson

11/28/04